DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 456 JC 960 035

AUTHOR Shirk, Joseph; Miller, Marie
TITLE Linking the Faculty Recognition Process to Teaching Excellence.
PUB DATE Feb 94
NOTE 10p.; In: Proceedings of the National Conference on Successful College Teaching (18th, Orlando, Florida, February 26-28, 1994); see JC 960 033.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Educational Quality; Excellence in Education; *Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

Recently, there has been a growing emphasis on excellence in teaching and research in academia. Evaluative activities used in decisions related to retention, tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases can be positively linked to renewing faculty excellence in teaching. The development or revision of a faculty recognition document should allow for maximum faculty input and reflect a consensus of the faculty within the division or department. Further, division chairs may employ such techniques as the evaluative conference to promote excellence. Other valuable tools include student evaluations, self evaluations, and peer evaluations. Finally, recommendations for determining appropriate measures to continually advance faculty effectiveness include the following: (1) address the importance of teaching in the faculty recognition document; (2) assign a majority of the total percentage of faculty recognition to teaching; (3) allow faculty the flexibility to elect a larger percentage of the total evaluative weight to teaching through the faculty recognition document; (4) encourage an atmosphere of collegiality; (5) allow faculty to receive evaluative letters before any evaluative conference; (6) encourage observation of teaching models; (7) develop faculty enrichment programs; (8) organize a faculty mentoring program; (9) develop faculty-guided media materials; and (10) organize informal faculty discussions about effective teaching practices and concerns. Contains 24 references. (TGI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 390 456

Linking the Faculty Recognition Process to Teaching Excellence

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Joseph Shirk
Marie Miller

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. Summers
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper included in the Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Conference on Successful College Teaching (Orlando, FL, February 26-28, 1994)

JC 940 035

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LINKING THE FACULTY RECOGNITION PROCESS TO TEACHING EXCELLENCE

Dr. Joseph Shirk
Dr. Marie Miller
Emporia State University

Abstract
This session will discuss ways in which the faculty recognition process for retention, tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases can be positively linked to renewing faculty excellence in teaching. Utilizing criteria within faculty recognition documents, the use of students evaluations, evaluative conferences, and teaching observations to promote teaching excellence will be examined.

Introduction
Among the most difficult and critical decisions administrators face are those involving evaluative decisions in faculty recognition. The process and procedure for evaluating faculty for retention, tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases varies within and throughout institutions of higher education. The impact of these decisions on academic programs and the lives of each faculty person is profound. Curricular offerings, short and long term needs of students, budgetary concerns, and various internal influences within institutions have significant influence on faculty recognition decisions.

> Faculty evaluation is perhaps the most difficult task that confronts the music executive on an ongoing basis. Administrative decisions based upon various formal and informal evaluative and monitoring policies and procedures have a lasting effect on students, departmental and overall institutional quality, and the professional and personal lives of those who are being evaluated. (Hipp, 1983)

Many institutions evaluate faculty in three broad categories: teaching, research, and service. The manner in which each category is addressed by faculty may be affected by the stated mission of the institution or the academic unit. Nevertheless, the overall performance of a faculty member is determined through the evaluation of each evaluative category. Faculties in music units and other disciplines in the arts are usually evaluated in these categories as well as in the area of creativity. Creativity in music may include activities such as musical performance or composition.

In the past few years the current climate in academia among institutions has been gradually shifting towards emphasizing and promoting excellence in teaching as well as research. This shift is the result of many factors not the least being public perception of higher education. In addition, the work of individuals such as Ernest Boyer has opened the door for a much broader interpretation of research within higher education. This interpretation embraces the various activities that constitute teaching as a part of the research component. The perception that teaching is given more emphasis in the faculty recognition process in music is validated by the research of Shirk (1993) and Runnels (1993). During their study on sources and criteria used in evaluating music faculty the authors surveyed all the music executives of accredited National Association of Schools of Music member institutions from Region IX. The results of their research indicates that the importance of teaching reflected the highest mean percentage of emphasis music administrators assign within the total evaluative process of faculty recognition in music.

> Music executives rank in order of importance the evaluative areas of faculty recognition for applied music faculty, ensemble directors, and various combinations of applied, ensemble, and/or classroom as follows: (1) teaching; (2) creativity (performance, composition); (3) service (to the institution, community, and profession); and (4) research (publications, presentations). In addition, music executives perceive that institutional administration and music faculty rank faculty in a similar manner. (Shirk and Runnels, 1993)

In addition, music executives reported that teaching reflects the highest mean percentage of emphasis that upper administration and music faculty assign within the total evaluative process of faculty recognition.

Problem

Although there have been a number of research studies on the evaluation of faculty in higher education, and to some extent with music faculty in particular, there is a lack of information addressing how the faculty recognition process can be used to promote excellence in teaching. Too often evaluation is a process of finding what is wrong rather than what can be done to improve performance. The diverse roles that faculty are required to address often seem to leave little, if any, time for promoting excellence in teaching.

Purpose of the Presentation

This presentation seeks to provide some insight on how the different evaluative activities used in recognition decisions involving retention, tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases can be positively linked to renewing faculty excellence in teaching. The faculty recognition document, student evaluations, teaching evaluations, faculty recognition committee, chair (administrative head), and the evaluative conference can be utilized to improve and promote teaching excellence.

Faculty Recognition Document

The faculty recognition document is the yardstick by which evaluative activities proceed. It is important that the document is clearly understood and supported throughout the administrative hierarchy and with the faculty it addresses. Although the percentage of weight each evaluative area is given varies among and within institutions, teaching is without question one of the evaluative areas under consideration.

> Teaching involves the presentation of knowledge, information, and ideas by methods that include lecturing, discussion, assignment and recitation, demonstration, laboratory exercise, practical experience, direct consultation with students, and so forth. (Tucker, 1984)

Because teaching involves a diverse number of activities, it is recommended that these be addressed as sources of criteria in the faculty recognition documents. The emphasis which teaching is given within the evaluation document should reflect the importance which it is given within the division or department. If teaching excellence is linked to the faculty evaluation document, it should be given a total evaluative weight which reflects its importance. It is not uncommon to have 50% to 70% of the evaluative weight given to teaching within the total evaluative categories. To promote excellence in teaching, it is essential that faculty within the unit have embraced the concept that teaching is the most important activity within which faculty can engage. An excerpt from the faculty recognition document in the Division of Music illustrates the importance of teaching.

> The Division of Music has established at least 50% of the total evaluative weight in faculty recognition matters in music be assigned to teaching, at least 20% to research, performance,creativity, and at least 10% to service. Each faculty member may elect to have the remaining 20% of the evaluative weight put into any of the above categories at the beginning of the evaluative period..If a faculty member does not elect this option he/she will be evaluated 60% teaching, 20% research/creativity, and 20% service. (Shirk, J. D., 1993)

The development or revision of a faculty recognition document should allow for maximum faculty input and reflect a consensus of the faculty within the division or department before it is sent for consideration to the upper administration. The following is a result of faculty input and consensus and clearly indicates the importance of excellence in teaching.

> Teaching is central to the mission of Emporia State University. It is therefore the expectation that each faculty member within the Division of Music will excel in carrying out their responsibilities in teaching. In the Division of Music, the primary objectives consist of the teaching and making of music. (Shirk, J. D., 1993)

It is vital that teaching excellence be linked to documents regarding faculty recognition. By doing so the pathway is open to encourage excellence in teaching.

Role of the Chair in Evaluative Conferences

The chair or head of a division or department may utilize a number of methods to encourage and promote teaching excellence. One of the most direct and effective ways is through the evaluative conference. Evaluative conferences may be periodic (such as an annual review) or may occur with greater frequency. Whatever the circumstance, it is commonly accepted that evaluative conferences are generally presupposed to be threatening in one way or another. It is not uncommon for a faculty member to approach an evaluative conference with an attitude of anxiety, suspicion and apprehension. The chair must counteract this attitude in order to maximize the benefits of the evaluative conference.

It is of particular importance that the evaluative conference be somewhat predictable from both the chair's perspective and that of the faculty member. The chair may help to relieve the stress and anxiety of an evaluative conference if the context of the conference is clearly understood by the faculty member before the conference. For that reason it is recommended that the faculty member preview the evaluative document before the meeting occurs with the chair. It is extremely important that the document is clearly written and that any strengths and/or weaknesses be addressed in an objective manner. It is then possible to develop an atmosphere of trust before the evaluative conference begins.

The faculty evaluative conference can help bring goals and objectives of the division or department and the individual faculty member together. Certainly within the goal of promoting teaching excellence, this can be true. Developing an atmosphere of collegiality is developing an atmosphere of sharing. Although a large part of the chair's role in evaluative conference should consist of praising individuals whose teaching has demonstrated excellence, the chair should encourage and support those who need to achieve teaching excellence. It is not only important that the chair address strengths and weaknesses in all areas of faculty evaluation, but that he/she do so in a calm and factual fashion. It is important when addressing weaknesses to focus on the activity or lack of activity that is causing the problem, not the character of the person. An atmosphere of trust should be maintained.

> Chairpersons should be concerned with how faculty members can be brought together, and not just for transacting department business or assailing each other with reports of their research. Teaching is essentially a process of interaction and one develops teaching skills by exchanging ideas and practices. (Eble, 1990)

The evaluative conference should include suggestions, strategies or informational items which can help foster the development of teaching excellence. Information regarding teaching conferences, current research, and sources of financial support for teaching activities should be distributed to faculty on an ongoing basis, but can be particularly useful during the evaluative conference.

Student Evaluations

Assessment of teaching effectiveness must be established upon determination of characteristics of good teaching. Such determinations can be broad (Highet, 1959) defining a good teacher as one who knows the subject, has a sense of humor, and enjoys students. Other literature report detailed specific continuum of good teacher attributes ranging from concern with class size to the quality of teacher-imposed examinations (Bridges, Ware, Brown, & Greenwood, 1971; Feldman, 1988; Hildebrand 1973; and Wortruba & Wright, 1975). Shermon et al. (1987) identified five characteristics of excellence in teaching agreed upon by both faculty and students: enthusiasm, clarity, preparation, organization, stimulation, and knowledge. These latter characteristics served as a model for the Division of Music's recent revision of student evaluative tools. Student evaluations have long served the role as a major measure of teaching effectiveness. These evaluations can provide formative feedback to the instructor encouraging professional growth and development. Within a different venue, such evaluation also serve as a summative measure of teaching effectiveness, generally utilized in merit and promotion considerations (Arreola, & Aleamoni, 1990).

A music program has some unique considerations in teaching evaluation. Music faculty members typically instruct within one or more of three distinct venues: classroom instruction, ensemble rehearsal, and applied lessons. Classroom instruction is similar to academic counterparts. Ensemble rehearsals are concerned with, primarily, outcomes of technically proficient and musically stimulating public performances, much akin to theatrical productions and artistic exhibits. Applied lessons are conducted one-to-one; student outcomes include developing

practical technical skills and strengthening musical understanding and interpretation. An additional outcome for most students is solo public performance.

In lieu of the diverse instructional situations, the Division of Music developed three distinct student evaluative tools (Appendix A) for course instruction, ensemble instruction, and applied lesson instruction. Division faculty had input into the development of these tools by means of initial discussion and constant review of the developing forms throughout the process.

Each evaluative tool is organized in similar and clearly defined topical sections (Arreola & Aleamoni, 1990). These different categories allow for more exact evaluative representation and serve to better aid in faculty instructional development. Positive statements were utilized throughout each tool. The fourth category, student self evaluation, provides an avenue for student ownership in the learning process.

The grading key is organized on a Likert scale format with pre-determined text explanations for the numbering system (Arreola, & Aleamoni, 1990). The two initial statements provide student demographics. These two statements, along with the three closing statements were mandated by Emporia State University for bias control. Each student also has the opportunity to complete (at his/her discretion) a free response for each course, ensemble, and applied lesson instruction (Appendix A).

Distribution, collection, and summarization of the student evaluations are processed in the office of the Associate Chair of the Division, removed from the central divisional office. Evaluations are administered approximately one month before the end of the semester. A procedural method is followed by all faculty members. Summarization services are provided by the University testing center. Results are transferred to a readable format (Appendix A). Faculty receive copies of the summarization form and all free responses after submission of final grades. Original copies are maintained in the divisional office.

Student evaluations are a consideration at the annual interview between the professor and division chair. These interviews are conducted in a positive, affirming manner. Together, the divisional chair and the faculty member explore all aspects of the student evaluations. Mutual agreement is attempted on plans for further teaching development.

Peer Evaluation

Student evaluative tools are one means of determining teaching effectiveness. Too often, these tools serve as the sole means of determination. Peer evaluation, in the form of instructional observations, presents a more concrete representation of the instructor. Peer observations are concerned, more often, with course objective and content, scholarship, and integration of the specific course into a divisional program (Centra & Bonesteel, 1990). Peer observers can effectively recognize the selection and organization of course content, and the utilization of teaching methods consistent with course material (Cohen & McKeachie, 1980).

The Division of Music utilizes peer evaluation as an aid to instructional development and improvement. Peer observers (members of the faculty-elected Faculty Recognition Committee) plan with the instructor date(s) for observation. One additional, unplanned observation is also conducted. Observers attend the first thirty minutes of a teaching session. All instructional formats (course, ensemble, and applied instruction) are observed. A single faculty member is observed by one member of the committee.

Evaluative comments are made upon a common divisional standardized form (Appendix A). This form utilizes a positive approach for the accumulation of observations. The Division Chair also visits at least one instructional session; the same form is utilized for evaluation. Peer evaluation forms are made available for merit and tenure decisions.

Self-Evaluation

The faculty participate in the evaluative process throughout the academic year. Each faculty member provides a self-evaluation by means of a division constructed form (Appendix A). This format provides a concrete personal

assessment of the three forms of faculty evaluation-teaching, creative work, and service. Each faculty member also completes and submits Evidence for Evaluation consistent with Divisional guidelines and including:

1. a current vitae
2. completed student evaluation forms
3. faculty self-evaluation form
4. annual accumulative addition (University form)
5. written evidence of course development, teaching syllabi, and teaching materials.

The individual evidence for evaluation serves the portfolio model and aids in the preparation of tenure/promotional materials.

Faculty Recognition Committee

The Faculty Recognition Committee, comprised of five members three of whom are tenured, is elected annually by the division faculty. The FRC makes recommendations to the chair of the division regarding faculty recognition matters involving retention, tenure, and promotion. Recommendations to the chair of music regarding merit salary increases are made by this committee if approved by faculty vote each year (Shirk, J. D. & Miller, M. C., 1992).

FRC faculty members also conduct faculty peer evaluations. FRC evaluation is based upon the individual faculty portfolio, student evaluations, and peer evaluations. Each committee member individually reviews materials. Upon completion of the review, the FRC committee members individually rank each faculty (scale of 1-5) on teaching, creative progress, and service. Scores are averaged by the committee chair (elected by committee membership) and forwarded to the division chair.

Role of the Chair as Facilitator

The chair is responsible for allocating funds for faculty development and should use these funds to promote areas of faculty responsibility. Certainly the teaching component is an area which the chair can support to help promote teaching excellence.

Travel funds to workshops, seminars, conventions which focus upon teaching strategies, techniques and knowledge base can help to renew and sustain faculty interest in teaching. It is particularly important to assist faculty who need help in successfully addressing their teaching responsibilities.

The chair can certainly encourage and promote faculty excellence in teaching through ways other than monetary assistance for travel. Student secretarial support, graduate assistant support, flexible class scheduling, and equipment and supply allocations provide invaluable assistance.

Of utmost importance is the attitude and sincere interest that the chair communicates to faculty regarding teaching. The chair sets the tone and mood for the importance of teaching through his or her example in and outside of the classroom.

Role of Student, Self, Peer Evaluation, and Chair in the Promotion of Teaching Excellence

Each of the above examined evaluations attempts to give a clearer image of the teaching abilities of the faculty member. Student evaluations tend to examine the environment of the learning situation, student motivation and learning, and student reaction to instructor-implemented methods of delivery. Peer evaluations can more readily assess course development, content, and organization. Self-evaluation most often examines the teacher-related processes and methods. A combination of peer and self evaluations can reveal a dedication of the instructor and valuing of the subject matter.

The three evaluative tools can serve as a motivational impetus to the faculty member for further development of teaching excellence. These tools can effectively demonstrate good teaching qualities as well as direct one's attention to items requiring improvement. Likewise, these evaluative tools, managed over an extended period, can evidence the faculty member's growth and development.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Together the division chair, the individual instructor, and the division faculty can determine the weight and influence of these tools. With least emphasis, these tools provide information applicable to the promotion and tenure processes.

Recommendations

For increased effectiveness, examination of the evaluative results can aid in the determination of appropriate measures to continually advance and improve the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. Some suggestions follow:

1. allow for maximum faculty input within the department or division faculty recognition document to build consensus
2. address the importance of teaching in the faculty recognition document
3. assign a majority of the total percentage of faculty recognition to teaching
4. allow through the faculty recognition document faculty the flexibility to elect a larger percentage of the total evaluative weight to teaching
5. encourage an atmosphere of collegiality within any formal evaluative conference by the chair and faculty
6. allow for faculty to receive evaluative letters before any evaluative conference by the chair and individual faculty member
7. encouraged observation of teaching models (within or outside the division
8. the development of faculty enrichment programs, workshops, and instructional sessions
9. the organization of a faculty mentoring program
10. faculty-guided preparation of media materials (especially applicable in a multi-sectional course)
11. organization of small informal faculty discussions about effective teaching practices
12. organization of informal discussions centered around common teaching concerns
13. encouragement to consult supportive nonevaluative colleagues about teaching processes (Lucas, 1989; McKeachie, 1982; Tucker, 1984)

Note: To obtain a copy of the Course Evaluation Form,, contact the writers directly at Emporia State University. See author reference.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrami, Philip C. (1989). How should we use student ratings to evaluate teaching? Research in Higher Education 30 (2), 221-227.

Arreola, R. A., & Aleamoni, L. M. (1990). Practical decisions in developing and operating a faculty evaluation system. In Theall, M. & Franklin, J. (Ed.), Student rating of instruction: Issues for improving practice (pp.37-55). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Bailey, D. (1981). Facing the future: Faculty productivity and development. Reston, VA: Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting 69, 146-154.

Bridges, C. M., Ware, W. B., Brown, B. B., & Greenwood, G. (197). Characteristics of the best and worst college teachers. Science Education, 55, 545-553.

Centra, J. A., & Bonesteel, P. (1990). College teaching: An art of a science? In Theall, M. & Franklin, J. (Ed.), Student rating of instruction: Issues for improving practice (pp.7-15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Cohen, P. A., & McKeachie, W. (1980). The role of colleagues in the evaluation of college teaching. Improving college and university teaching, 8 (4), 147154.

Eble, K. E. (1990). Chairpersons and faculty development. Bennett, J.B. & Figuli, D. J., Enhancing departmental leadership, (p. 102). NewYork: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Feldman, K. A. (1988). Effective college teaching from the students' and faculty's view: Matched or mismatched priorities? Research in Higher Education, 28,291-344.

Highet, G. (1959). The art of teaching. New York: Vintage Books.

Hildebrand, G. (1973). The character and skills of the effective professor. Journal of Higher Education 44, 41-50.

Hipp,W.(1983). Evaluating music faculty. Princeton,New Jersey: Prestige Publication.

Jaques, E. (1979). Taking time seriously in evaluating jobs. Harvard Business Review 57 (5), 124-132.

Lewis, L. (1983). The definition of academic merit. Higher Education 12 (G), 707-719.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1983). The structure of promotion and tenure decisions in institutions of higher education: A policy analysis. The Review of Higher Education 6 (3),217-231

Lucas, A. F. (1989). Motivating faculty to improve the quality of teaching. In Lucas, A. F. (Ed.), The department chairperson's role in enhancing college teaching (pp.5-15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.

McKeachie, W. J. (1982). The rewards of teaching. In McKeachie, W. J. (Ed.), Motivating professors to teach effectively (pp. 7-13). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.

Miller, R. (1988). Merit pay in United States post secondary institutions. Higher Education 17/2,219-232.

Sherman, T. M., Armistead, L. P., Fowler, F., Barksdale, M. A., & Reif, G. (1987). The quest for excellence in university teaching. Journal of Higher Education, 58, 66-84.

Shirk, J.D., (1993). Division of music faculty recognition document. Emporia, KS: Division of Music.

Shirk, J. & Miller, M. C. (1992). Division of music faculty handbook: 1992-1993. Emporia, KS: Division of Music.

Shirk, J. D. & Runnels, B. D. (1992). Policies and procedures in music faculty recognition decisions in NASM region 9 institutions. Reston, VA: Proceedings of the 67th Annual Meeting 80 123-144.

Tucker, A. (1984). Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers (2nd ed.). New York: MacMillan.

Wotruba, T. A., & Wright, P. L. (1975). How to develop a teacher-rating instrument: A research approach. Journal of Higher Education, 46,

Zirkel, P. A. (1985). Faculty review in the promotion and tenure process beyond the departmental level. Planning for Higher Education 13/4, 15-17.